

rights of the minority under the House rules.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, we in the minority do not wish to use dilatory tactics to make our points, and I will not object to the gentleman's request. What we do want is an honest debate of the issue, at which time our amendments would not be dismissed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

□ 1030

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would just conclude by suggesting that we hope in the future that the rights of the minorities in committees will be respected, that we will have full opportunity for hearings.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLINGER. Let me say that I recognize this was an extraordinary, but not unprecedented, procedure that was engaged in, Mr. Speaker. I want to assure the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip, that this is not a procedure that I would intend to pursue on a regular basis.

My full intention would be to hold hearings on matters that would come under the jurisdiction of our committee in an orderly fashion and proceed to markup, but this was not an unprecedented action. I would remind the gentleman that in the past my committee, which was formerly under the control of your party, did indeed waive jurisdiction over a number of bills which were then brought to the floor for consideration, primarily on the Budget Reform Act.

So I agree that it was an extraordinary procedure, and I assure the gentleman it will not be followed on a routine basis, but that it was not unprecedented.

Mr. BONIOR. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the new chairman of the committee is pledging to us today that this procedure will not be the norm and will not be followed, and that we will have full and open debate in hearings in the future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would engage the distinguished majority leader in a colloquy on the schedule next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, next week the House will not be in session on Monday in observance of the Martin Luther King holiday.

We will meet on Tuesday. At the request of the minority we will meet at 9:30 for morning hour. We will consider one suspension, S. 2, the Congressional Accountability Act.

We intend to ask, by unanimous consent, to deal with accrued leave on Tuesday, but I must advise the minority, we are still working out the details. We are working with the minority. We think we are very likely able to raise that point also on Tuesday.

If votes are ordered on Tuesday, they will be detained until after 5 o'clock.

On Wednesday we will be in pro forma session, beginning at 11 o'clock.

Thursday, the House will meet at 10 o'clock and consider the rule on H.R. 5, unfunded mandates legislation. Pending passage of the rule, we will proceed to 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 5.

On Friday, the House will meet at 10 o'clock and take up amendments to H.R. 5, and early, as promised, the House will adjourn by approximately 3 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would pose this concern to my friend, the gentleman from Texas. Over the years we have on this side of the aisle, when we were in the majority, had a tradition of notifying the minority of our schedule on Thursday. There have been exceptions to that, but they were extremely rare. We have consistently over the years paid the minority the courtesy of providing them with information in advance.

This information that my friend, the gentleman from Texas, is giving us this morning is new. We just received this information. I would hope in the future that we would have the ability to know further in advance what the schedule will be for the following week.

The second point I would make to the gentleman is that I am disappointed that the accrued leave bill is not before us today. I hope that we will have it before us on Tuesday, and we will be able to vote on it. The people who have earned these leave days by the sweat of their brow, by working for this institution, deserve to know that they will have what is coming to them, and what they have earned, so I hope that we will move forward on this Tuesday. We will be extremely disappointed if that does not happen.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The gentleman needs to know that this side was ready and willing to take up the accrued leave, which the gentleman from California intended not just to cover committee Members but personal staff as well, since I was concerned about the separation that was occurring between the way in which commit-

tee staff were being handled and Members' offices were being handled.

However, it came to our attention late yesterday that Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle, while he was still the majority, had dismissed some people on the 1st, 2d, and 3d of January.

The motion that we had instructed was at the beginning of the time that we became the majority, so the delay between today and Tuesday is to accommodate your side of the aisle, to make sure no one is left out of the accrued leave.

We are working out an amendment which will extend the time frame into the 103d Congress, covering those employees on the 1st, 2d, and 3d. So the delay is to make sure that everyone is accommodated. That is the reason for the delay.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for the explanation. I was not aware of that. I was aware that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] had signed off on the legislation, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR] came all the way in from Arizona to do it today, so you can imagine the disappointment on our side when we heard that it was not happening.

We will look into the gentleman's concerns, and I thank him for clarifying that.

I would also ask my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], when we do the balanced budget amendment, when it goes to the Committee on Rules, does the distinguished majority leader anticipate an open rule on that particular piece of legislation as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the chairman of the committee, has suggested?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, to return to an earlier point, there is a whip notice that is going out perhaps as we speak to notify Members of the schedule for next week.

These are extraordinary times, and I can assure the gentleman that as we proceed with the rest of the year, we will do our very best to minimize the gentleman's disappointments.

□ 1040

We are working on the rule for the balanced budget amendment, and to this point we have determined that we will be asking a preprinting requirement. We are most likely to not allow amendments except amendments in the nature of a substitute.

If the gentleman has any further questions, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules I am sure would be more than happy to address them.

Mr. BONIOR. I do have further questions I would ask my friend from New York if he intends to limit the number of amendments in the nature of a substitute or are we going to have an open expression of a variety of different substitutes on this particular piece of legislation?

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to my good friend that the gentleman knows that under former Presidents of the Democrat majority rule when we have had constitutional amendments come to the floor, we are following generally the same procedure, because it is so terribly complex. I would hope that we could entertain any legitimate substitute and have it made in order. However, there is going to be a constraint of time. Probably an ample number of amendments might be three or four on your side and possibly one on our side that may not be supported by the Republican leadership necessarily.

We want to be fair to everyone. We want to give everybody their fair shot. I would hope that that is the procedure we could arrive at.

We are going to be holding that hearing, incidentally, on Monday, January 23, that is a week from Monday, at 1 p.m. Again we hope that the membership will come up and we can discuss it and we would be glad to consult with the minority.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman intend to employ a procedure known as king-of-the-hill or queen-of-the-hill or do you plan on inventing a new procedure for us and surprising us?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman knows that this gentleman has always been opposed to king-of-the-hill, where a substitute or an amendment could pass not having received the largest number of votes. That is not going to happen anymore. If we have any procedure at all, it will be the fair procedure of the substitute passing with the most votes wins. That is the way it should be on the floor of this House, and that is the way it should be in any committee.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague from New York and my friend from Texas.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, January 17, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### A VIEW ON THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, the Great Depression dealt the biggest economic blow this Nation has ever faced. The epidemic seemed never-ending, sweeping everything away in its path of economic destruction.

In the election of 1932, with the economy still contracting, Franklin Roosevelt complained of Hoover's deficit spending and raised the issue of the need to balance the Federal budget. However, by the end of the decade, the economy was improving under the direction of President Roosevelt and his New Deal policies, without calling for a constitutional amendment. Now, in 1995, we are visiting this issue again. As we dialog today, though, we must reflect on the lessons learned from yesterday.

As students of the economy, we know that if an economy is operating below its capacity to produce, the result is a cause for cyclical downturn. And if the Government needs to raise revenues or must spend less—requirements that will be unconditionally placed on this institution if the balanced budget amendment is passed—economic activity depresses further. Therefore, the efforts during the early 1930's to balance the budget might be theoretically counted as an economic contributor to prolonging the depression cycle.

This lesson rings as a reminder that there are situations which require economic responses other than constitutionally mandating that the Federal budget be balanced.

I urge my colleagues to further dialog on this issue.

#### BUDGET CUTS NEEDED FOR GAO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the 104th Congress begins to examine areas to cut Federal spending, this Member would like to convey his strong support for reduced funding levels for the General Accounting Office [GAO], an investigative arm of the U.S. Congress.

Last year during consideration of the fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations bill, this Member offered an amendment to cut funding for GAO by 5 percent below the fiscal year 1994 level. Unfortunately, this amendment failed by a close vote even though three committee chairmen vigorously worked against it on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, during a time when the American public has called for reduced Federal spending, the GAO has continued to undergo funding increases. Most recently, GAO received a funding level

of \$430.2 million in fiscal year 1994, and the House fiscal year 1994 legislative branch appropriations bill included a fiscal year 1995 funding level of \$439.5 million—an increase of \$9.4 million. The final fiscal year 1995 conference report for legislative branch appropriations included \$449 million for GAO, \$10 million more than the House-passed bill. This Member's amendment would have reduced the fiscal year 1995 funding level of GAO to \$408.7 million, a reduction of \$30.9 million from the committee-approved bill, and \$21.5 million below fiscal year 1994's funding level.

This Member strongly believes that GAO is an agency where growth is out of control. It is an agency which also has not been responsive to individual Members, especially those who serve in the minority. The quality of work produced by the GAO is increasingly shoddy. While the quality of the work varies dramatically, unfortunately and inappropriately, all GAO reports are given the same high respect and credibility simply because they are GAO products. The level of personnel and budgetary resources provided to GAO for its work now is excessive and has grown disproportionately when compared with other congressional support agencies. In addition, GAO resources are also used in certain questionable cases for consultants, training, and for various unnecessary expenses. Concern has also been expressed that GAO is more interested in getting headlines than in supporting the Congress with required information.

From 1985 to 1993, the number of GAO investigations doubled from 457 per year to 915. In addition, GAO's budget jumped from \$46.9 million in 1965 to our current spending level of \$449 million, a percentage increase of nearly 1,000 percent in unadjusted dollars.

In fiscal year 1994, the number of full-time equivalent positions at GAO were reduced from the fiscal year 1993 amount by approximately \$6 million and 100 positions. However, additional cuts are still needed to account for the past growth at this agency, which this Member will outline. In 1980, for example, funding for GAO staff cost \$204 million. By 1985 that had grown to \$299 million. In 1988 it was \$330 million, and in 1989, \$346 million. The average increase between 1980 and 1990 was 8 percent per year. Then, in 1991, GAO was increased by 14 percent, to a total of \$409 million. In 1992, GAO received another 8-percent increase to \$443 million.

The GAO is the largest support agency for Congress, and, incredibly, its budget represents more than one-quarter of the total fiscal year 1995 legislative branch appropriations. GAO's budget is 7½ times the size of the Congressional Research Service, 19 times the size of the Congressional Budget Office, and 20 times the size of the Office of Technology Assessment.

According to a Democratic Study Group [DSG] special report issued on